

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,419	08/01/2003	James M. Tour	11321-P022WUD1	4375
47744 ´ 7590 11/28/2007 WINSTEAD PC		EXAMINER		
WINSTEAD PC			HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
P. O. BOX 50784 DALLAS, TX 75201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/632,419	TOUR ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stuart Hendrickson	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re- vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON , cause the application to become AB	CATION. apply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Second 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 2.	action is non-final.	• •			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 36-68,88-93 and 131 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 36-68,88-93 and 131 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to by the Examine 10) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyantion is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 			

Art Unit: 1793

The election of SWNTs is noted. All claims are under consideration. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 36-68, 88-93, 131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruoff et al. 5547748.

Ruoff teaches nanomaterials functionalized by diazonium groups; see especially col. 8 lines 50-60. Although Ruoff does not discuss nanotubes, they are suggested by the teaching of curved surfaces having pentagons in the sheet. Thus, treating a SWNT is an obvious expedient to form a catalyst or electron emitter. The location of functionalization is deemed possessed or an obvious expedient, even though the reaction is preferentially at the ends where the pentagons are; the claim only requires minimal reaction at one site.

Claims 36-47, 49-68, 88-93, 131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kelly article.

Kelly teaches swnts functionalized at the sidewall; butylated nanotubes are mentioned on pg. 445. Even though the process steps are not the same, no difference is seen in the product; the product does not require diazonium groups. Fig. 3a shows a large number of groups (claim 60).

Applicant's arguments filed 9/13/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The claims do not exclude end-derivatization, and no difference is seen in the product.

The arguments to the process are not persuasive as to product claims, especially as the product

need not have diazo groups. Applicants are reminded of flesh duty of disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754